that no false training can entirely eradicate, to which its objects appeal; for noble forms, which are the symbols of goodness, have a natural tendency to exalt the mind; but this truth is not generally recognised, and art is estimated too much from an intellectual point of view to the neglect of the spiritual. Few men, it has been well observed, have a proper sense of an æsthetic *whole*; and this narrowness of comprehension reflects back an injurious influence upon the quality of art-produce; for if a picture, a bas-relief, or a building be beautifully executed, it passes current as a true work, though, weighed in a just balance, it be false and wrong.

But a cause of the inefficacy of art which I have not heard adverted to, is its not being reflected in the daily lives of artists: we look for the most vivid manifestation of religion in the demeanour of its ministers; and if we do not find it, we hearken but impatiently to their precept. The artist is a revealer of the beautiful and true to others, but what does the truth and beauty of the universe profit himself? I use the word "artist" here in its widest sense, as including poet and musician along with the painter, sculptor, and architect; and I speak of them advisedly, and say, that whatever effect their art may have upon the lives of others, it appears to have none upon their own. Not only are their lives not in keeping with their professional achievements, but they are more out of harmony with the whisperings of art than other men's. So far from being great men,—men commensurate with their works,—they are, taken as a body, *less* than men. Individual exceptions could of course be pointed to—uniform and consistent men—stars in the hemisphere of art-history; and some, too, of the first magnitude, who have exhibited an epic grandeur in their lives, that shed an after lustre on their works; but, as a body, the reproach lies at the door of all generations of artists, and reaches to the very highest names, that inspiration is in their art-utterance alone,—that they are of those who *say* and *do* not; they are priests to the goddess of the fair and the pure, but they are not lovely in their lives. A living writer refers to this mysterious discrepancy as exemplified in the life of Shakspeare, and utters a pathetic lament over the fact that this man of men, who gave to the science of mind a new and larger subject than had before existed, and planted the standard of humanity some furlongs forward into chaos, should not have been wise for himself, that he should have led an obscure and profane life, using his genius for the public amusement! This is perhaps an extreme case, and, indeed, few could be pointed to so mournful in the contrast it presents; but the name is legion of those who never vindicated as *men* the high-standing which they claimed as *artists;* and the most melancholy reflection is, that the living race, to which I am of course precluded from making individual allusion, is not perceptibly better than the preceding one. Still—

> "The wise want love, and those who love want wisdom."

The "eccentricities of genius" generally means its follies and weaknesses; and the calamities and distresses of poets and others, of insensibility to which on the part of the public we are constantly hearing the reiterated complaint, are generally traceable to a non-fulfilment of the conditions on which alone comfort and happiness can be secured.

Is it a moral necessity,—an inevitable result of devotion to the service of art,—that men whose genius sheds a light upon our path, should stumble as in darkness themselves, and be wanting in self-government as well as deficient in reference to moral relations? If it be, it would, indeed, be better to dispense with art itself. But a small measure of faith in the rectitude of the divine government is sufficient to convince us that this is not the case, and that we shall yet behold, to quote the writer before cited,—"what the world has long needed,—its poet-priest, who shall see, speak, and act with equal inspiration."

SAMUEL HUGGINS.

LETTERS TO A LADY,

EMBODYING

A Popular Sketch of the History of Architecture,

AND THE CHARACTERISTICS OF

THE VARIOUS STYLES WHICH HAVE PREVAILED.*

My dear Sorillah:

SINCE I wrote my second letter, which included a few remarks on Assyrian architecture, some additional examples of the art of that nation have been deposited in the National Museum, especially some more of the enormous winged animals which originally formed the doorways in the palaces or temples. I should have pointed out to you, in proof of my observation that Greece had some of her art from Assyria, the prototype of what is known as the Greek honeysuckle on several of the incised slabs in the cellars, but I thought it would come more forcibly before you when we are tracing the progress of Grecian art. You will observe, too, that *arched* doorways, and even what seems to be a bridge with arches, are represented on some of the slabs; but to these I will refer when speaking of the history of the arch. You will, of course, remember that there may be a considerable difference in the age of Assyrian monuments, ranging, as they do, from 2,200 years before Christ to 600 B.C. when the final destruction of Nineveh was effected.

The arrow-headed or cuneiform characters seen on the Babylonish bricks are found also at PERSEPOLIS, the ancient capital of Persia, and serve to show, with winged bulls at the entrances, and other coincidences, a certain degree of connection between the modes of building in the two cities. Of the latter there are more perfect ruins remaining than of Babylon, especially those of the *Chehil Minar*, or Great Hall of Xerxes; and in these there is seen to be a coincidence both with Egyptian architecture as we now know it, and the Temple of Solomon at Jerusalem, as described in the Bible. Mr. Morier, in his novel of "Abel Allnutt," has introduced a serious dissertation to prove that the ruins of the "Temple of Forty Columns" afford specimens of the architecture and general character of the Temple of Solomon.

The description of Solomon's Temple to be found in the 1st Book of Kings (ch. vi.) and the 2nd Book of Chronicles (ch. ii. and iii.) shows the enormous scale on which building operations were then conducted. 80,000 men were set to hew in the mountains, 70,000 to bear burdens, and 3,300 to overlook and direct. The building consisted of the main body of the temple, a porch or portico in front, and the *sanctum* behind. The length of the body of the temple in feet (if we consider the cubit as 1 foot 6 inches) was 60 feet, and the width 30 feet, or one-half the length. The height was 45 feet, or half the length of the temple and *sanctum* together. The *sanctum* was 30 feet long and 30 feet wide. The porch extended the whole width of the building, and projected 15 feet, or half its width. The whole of these dimensions show curious attention to harmony and proportion.

The temple was surrounded by three tiers of chambers, which were approached by stairs. They laid the foundations with great stones, costly and hewed, and the whole when completed was decorated in the most sumptuous manner. The two brazen pillars made by Hiram of Tyre resemble very closely, with their "nets of checker-work, wreaths of chain-work," "pomegranates," and "lily-work," both Persepolitan and Egyptian columns. The description of the position of these columns has led to much discussion. Perhaps it was analogous to that of obelisks before Egyptian buildings.

From the 1st Book of Chronicles we learn that the temple was built from a previously arranged plan. It says, "Then David gave to Solomon his son the pattern of the porch, and the houses thereof, and of the treasuries thereof, and of the upper chambers thereof, and of the inner parlours thereof, and of the place of the mercy-seat, and the pattern of all that he had by the Spirit, of the courts of the house of the Lord, and of all the chambers round about, of the treasuries of the house of God, and of the treasuries of the dedicated things."

Solomon was a great builder. Besides the Temple, for which David had prepared, he raised the House of the Forest of Lebanon, a much larger structure, a house for himself and one for his queen. All these were of costly stones, described, you remember, as "sawed with saws within and without, even from the foundation to the coping." Some of the stones were more than 18 feet long. He also built many "fenced cities," with "walls and gates:" especially Tadmor, in the Wilderness, now known as PALMYRA. The *existing* ruins here, it should be mentioned, are of a date long posterior; probably after Trajan.

The fact that Solomon married one of Pharoah's daughters about 1013 years before Christ (at which period, as we shall hereafter see, the Egyptians had erected many great structures), shows his connection with that wonderful country, and prepares us to find, at all events a coincidence in their buildings. Moreover, the Tyrians, to whom Solomon sent for a "cunning man," to work in gold, silver, brass, and iron, are supposed by some writers to have been extensively employed as architects by the Egyptians.

And now, instead of floating longer amongst the rills and tributaries, we will plunge into the main stream of progress, and speak of a people whose history, although obscure, is nevertheless more clearly to be traced, and comes more vividly before us, than that to which I have previously referred.

EGYPT, the "gift of the Nile," as it is often

* No. III. See p. 133 and p. 100.

For a comprehensive guide on PDF Compression and OCR visit our website